

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Louis C. Hiner, Veteran Newspaperman,
DiesEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute to pay tribute to a great journalist, a great Hoosier and a great American.

Louis C. Hiner was associated with the Rushville Republican for 63 years. He was 71 years old when he died last week.

Mr. Hiner was a man who proudly served his community, State and country. A small town like Rushville, Ind., needed Lou Hiner. His newspaper nursed the town's ills, boasted of its victories and moaned its defeats.

He began his work on the Rushville Republican when he was 9 years old as a newspaper carrier. At the end of his career he was editor and president.

Not only did Mr. Hiner leave Rushville with a real newspaper tradition. But he left two fine sons who will carry on his tradition. His son, Lou, Jr., is the Washington correspondent for the Indianapolis News. His other son, Richard, is sports editor of the Rushville paper.

To these sons and the rest of the family I extend my sympathy.

Hiner was past president of the Indiana Republican Editorial Association and a member of the Hoosier State Press Association and founded one of the State's first papers in the 19th century at Rising Sun, Ind. Mr. Hiner's brother was the late Allen C. Hiner, editor of the New Castle Courier-Times.

Mr. Hiner will be missed. But he will be remembered by many Hoosiers and they are all better off for knowing him.

The following article appeared in the Republican following Mr. Hiner's death:

LOUIS C. HINER, VETERAN LOCAL NEWSPAPERMAN, DIES

Louis C. Hiner, 71, editor of The Rushville Republican for the past 39 years, died suddenly at his home, 1023 North Harrison, at 3:30 o'clock Thursday afternoon.

Although he had been ill with a throat ailment for the past several weeks, his death was unexpected. It occurred shortly after he returned home following an examination at the Indiana University Medical Center, Indianapolis.

Connected with the newspaper business for more than six decades, Mr. Hiner began his long career as a carrier boy for The Republican at the age of nine.

Later on he began his employment here as a reporter and sportswriter. Mr. Hiner was appointed editor in 1928 and then was made president of The Republican Co., Inc., in April of 1950. He still retained both of these positions at the time of his death.

Mr. Hiner was one of the pioneer writers of high school basketball in Indiana and he also authored one of the state's first hard-wood columns, "Hittin' 'em and Missin' 'em," in The Republican.

Despite his declining health, Mr. Hiner continued to come down to his desk every morning. Wednesday was his last day at the office.

A resident of Rushville most of his life, he lived briefly in Roswell, N.M., and Astoria,

Ore., where he also was employed on newspapers in his younger life.

He was born in Rushville on April 30, 1895, the son of Robert J. and Clara East Hiner. On May 13, 1916, he was married to Rubye M. Isaacs, who died on October 15, 1946.

Mr. Hiner was graduated from Rushville High School in 1914.

Journalism was deeply rooted in the family's heritage. His grandfather, William Gregory, was a pioneer Hoosier journalist who founded one of Indiana's first newspapers at Rising Sun during the 19th century. His two sons also are in the newspaper profession.

A past president of the Indiana Republican Editorial Association and a member of the Hoosier State Press Association and Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism society, Mr. Hiner was a member of the Main Street Christian Church and the Rushville Elks Lodge. He was a charter member of the local Kiwanis Club.

Surviving are two sons, Louis C. Hiner, Jr., of Falls Church, Va., who heads the Indianapolis News Bureau in Washington, D.C., and Richard G. Hiner, R. R. 4, sports editor and assistant editor of The Republican, and four grandchildren.

His brother, the late Allen C. Hiner, was once editor of the New Castle Courier-Times.

The Rev. Richard Merriman will conduct funeral services at 3:30 p.m. Saturday at the Wyatt Moore Memorial, where friends may call any time, with entombment following in East Hill Shrine Mausoleum.

The Need for Firearms Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, everyone recognizes the fact that crime in our streets is rapidly increasing and has become a national disgrace. In an effort to bring a halt to this blight, the administration has requested, and many of my colleagues have introduced, firearms legislation designed to make traffic in guns more difficult for the criminal.

Mr. Speaker, in my estimation much of this proposed gun legislation makes it difficult for the law-abiding citizen to bear arms as guaranteed in the Constitution while it places very few actual restrictions on their use by criminals.

I believe the greatest deterrent to crime is the fear of punishment so I therefore wish to introduce the following legislation which would impose a mandatory sentence of 25 years in prison for anyone using a gun that has been transported in interstate commerce in the commission or attempted commission of any robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, kidnapping, or homicide.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill prohibiting use in the commission and attempted commission of certain crimes of firearms transported in interstate commerce

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whoever, during the commission or attempted commission of any robbery, assault, murder,

rape, burglary, kidnaping, or homicide (other than involuntary manslaughter), uses or carries any firearm which has been transported across the boundary of a State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or possession of the United States shall be imprisoned for twenty-five years.

Cal Farley's Living Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, the Panhandle of Texas lost a friend, a man who was known and loved by hundreds. Cal Farley was fatally stricken while attending chapel at his beloved Boys Ranch near Amarillo. Wes Izzard of the Amarillo Daily News has expressed the loss we all feel at the passing of Cal Farley in the following article:

CAL FARLEY'S LIVING LEGACY

(By Wes Izzard)

Three things there were that made Cal Farley great.

He had a God-given insight into what makes boys tick.

He had a powerful sense of dedication that drove him to do something about those boys in whom the ticking was off-beat.

And he had an instinctive grasp of the mechanics needed to do this job on a big scale—organization, salesmanship.

The world is full of men endowed with one of these gifts. There are a few who possess two of them.

But rare indeed is the man who has all three.

Cal Farley was a persuasive man. It was hard to say no to him.

He had a talent for making others see the boy problem as he saw it. This talent was not cultivated. He took no courses in salesmanship. He read no books on how to influence others. It was just that his earnest common sense and concern were eloquent and unanswerable.

Those of us who knew Cal through the years found him a warm and witty friend, as well as a dedicated hero of the wayward boy. He could have been a great sports writer, or radio personality.

He attended the World Series several times, and sent back to this newspaper stories that rivaled the baseball tales of Ring Lardner. And some of the most colorful sports broadcasting ever heard over an Amarillo station was wrapped in the excited, knowledgeable voice of Cal Farley.

It is a time of shock for his friends. But the mourning need not be for long.

While his quiet counsel will be missed—perhaps desperately, for a while—his job was all but finished. He had carried the building of Boys Ranch to a point from which it can go on indefinitely.

The region and the nation should be grateful that he was spared for this.

He has achieved an immortality that few men attain. It lies in the regeneration of 2,000 human beings who passed his way—2,000 boys, some rebellious, some lost, some just bewildered.

His influence thus becomes a living legacy that will go on through all generations to come.

To repeat, Cal Farley knew boys. And as he was wholly articulate on the subject, his

February 23, 1967

conversation and speeches teemed with quotable observations. Here are a few:

"A boy is the only thing God can use to make a man."

"A good man dies when a boy goes wrong."

"Who wants to hit a home run if nobody is watching?"

"Our nation is no stronger than the boys who walk its streets."

"If you want your child to love you, teach him to mind."

"In most homes when you take the father out you take out the police department."

"There's no new romance in milking a cow at 6:30 in the morning, but it's a sure way of getting your breakfast."

"Give a boy enough rope and he'll bring home a stray dog at the end of it."

Statement by F. Allen Calvert, Jr., President of the Independent Petroleum Association of America

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY F. ALLEN CALVERT, JR., PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, FEBRUARY 21, 1967

The United States Congress should act immediately to investigate the threat of Interior Undersecretary Charles F. Luce, obviously acting at the direction of higher authority, to undermine the security-oriented oil import program as a political power play to prevent a partial and fully justified restoration in oil prices.

Actions threatened are questionable as to achieving the ends sought as well as to their legality. Congress has delegated no price-fixing authority to the Administration. Lacking such authority, the Administration proposes to misuse a law designed for one purpose and one purpose only—to preserve the nation's security.

The actions proposed are illogical. They would penalize domestic independent producers who by any yardstick have suffered direly the past ten years, and whose participation in domestic exploration and drilling is vital to our future oil supplies. The need to find additional oil supplies in the U.S. is well known to the Government.

In addition to the questionable legality of these threats, and lack of assurance that they would work, actions to increase foreign military purchases of petroleum products and import additional gasoline supplies would aggravate our chronic balance of payments problem, in which oil imports already are the largest adverse factor.

Such action is inconceivable when government has at its fingertips facts which show that oil prices for a decade have been going down while prices generally have been going up. In addition, industry has annually absorbed higher wages, increased costs for materials and additional taxes. Oil is one major industry that has not contributed to inflation. Now that its prices are moving toward nominal recovery, the industry is to be politically horsewhipped.

Lastly, such actions would destroy confidence in a program which has been admirably administered by those responsible for import regulations in the Interior Department. The nation's security as to petroleum supplies makes it essential to maintain the integrity and effectiveness of the import program.

**When Should We Buy Antiballistic
Missile Defense?**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, our system of defense has recently been based upon a so-called balance between the United States nuclear capability and the Russian nuclear capability. It has been fairly clear as to what weapons systems are on our side of the scale. Our space satellites and our intelligence agencies have attempted to give us a reasonable glimpse at which is on Russia's side of the scale. We now know beyond a doubt that an ABM defense is being deployed around Moscow.

In the meantime the Johnson administration is taking a grave risk in timing in order to avoid the cost, and hopefully the need, for such a defense system.

One thing is certain, we cannot place the Nation in jeopardy by relying on just the words of the Communist military leaders. The balance can only be maintained by knowing for a fact that Russia is keeping any agreements which we may reach. An inspection-type agreement would probably be necessary in order to have some reasonable assurance that our Nation is secure.

Under unanimous consent I include an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star, February 21, 1967, in the Record at this point. This editorial gives an excellent assessment of our present situation.

The editorial follows:

WHEN SHOULD WE BUY ABM DEFENSE?

The name of the game is strategic dominance.

That's the game we're playing in the world today, mostly against the Soviet Union.

It's a simple game. The nation that has strategic dominance can say, "This is the way it is going to be." The other nations must say "Yes sir," and they must say it quickly, before the dominant nation blasts them off the face of the earth.

Right now, it's a tie between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. We both have massive striking forces, almost over-powering offenses. But—and this is the point that is the biggest worry to the Defense Department—the Russians are developing an antiballistic missile system. And we're not.

The argument, advanced by the State Department at a recent seminar for editorial writers, is this: If the Soviets perfect an antiballistic missile (ABM) system and we don't, they can say "your missiles cannot get through to destroy our country, and ours can get through to yours—therefore you will do as we say, and our first command is that you do not attempt to build an ABM system." And we will answer, "Yes sir."

If this possible disaster exists why don't we build an ABM system immediately? Answer, by the Defense Department, because they are so horribly, almost prohibitively expensive. How then can the Russians build one? Because they are only building one around Moscow—so far, at any rate.

Secondly, says the Defense Department, if we can delay committing ourselves till the last moment, we can develop a superior ABM system—and this is a method that has always paid off. For instance, the English in World War II produced a superior fighter plane to

that of the Germans because they developed one later.

We could, Defense says, order an ABM system immediately. We have researched them and are familiar with them, they say, but we have not bought—we're still shopping around. American corporations have the know how and can go ahead when the President gives the word. But the question is, when should we give the word?

The Soviet missile capability is going up. Their ABM system, which will be effective by 1970, will protect the Soviet Union heartland. The U.S., even if it started now, couldn't have one by then. So the question gets more pertinent every day. How much lead time can we give the Russians?

Thus President Johnson worries and moves closer to giving the go-ahead to ring the Continental U.S. with an ABM system even at the staggering cost of \$40 billion.

Indeed, the President has asked Congress for \$375 million to get ABM going, using the proposed Nike X system. He hedges by saying he will not give the construction order unless he cannot reach agreement with the Russians on a ban of ABM systems.

This ban, like all such agreements, is based on the idea of keeping the one-to-one relationship. If you and I we say to Russia, build ABM systems we'll still be tied to strategic dominance, but we'll both be nearly bankrupt trying to pay for them. Let's save ourselves the money and agree not to build ABMs.

But—and this is where the difference of opinion in this nation comes to a focus—the Russians already have started, indeed have Moscow pretty well protected against any missile attack. Secondly, how can we trust them not to proceed covertly?

Congress itself leans toward buying the ABM at once. Every year it hopefully appropriates some money for this defense system which could tip the balance in strategic dominance—but Defense Secretary McNamara refuses to spend it.

The Defense Secretary, in addition to thinking it best to wait till the last moment to buy ABM, also leans toward the view that we should build bigger missiles, ones that will penetrate the Soviet ABM. And, he adds, how about stacking some decoys on these missiles to throw their ABMs into utter confusion? We'll get through somehow with our massive power, says offense-minded McNamara.

Other top military strategists, however, fear we might not have the power to deter nuclear war or survive it, unless we have an ABM system. They fear, too, that a deal we make with the often-tricky Russians on an ABM ban is a feeble basis for our security.

This is the argument for and against antiballistic missile systems. More, much more, will be heard of it in 1967. The matter of ABM system is a matter of timing and trust—and in the end will be a judgment decision by the Congress.

Chattanooga Center Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the problem of mental retardation, and the establishment and improvement of adequate treatment facilities, is a very real challenge to any State government operating with limited revenues. The work of the Orange Grove Center in Chattanooga has been particularly note-